

REMARKS

Claim 1-4, 6, 7, 14-21 and 23 are pending in this application. Reconsideration of the application based on the following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6, 7, 14-21 and 23 have been rejected as being anticipated by Kirmse (USP 6,699,125). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection on the following basis.

Kirmse discloses an invention related to an online game. In Kirmse, there exists an inviter 12(1) who starts a game and an invitee 12(2) who participates in the game, and Kirmse comprises a game server 14 storing necessary data for performing the game and a message server 18 storing information about a user (address and connection status). This configuration of Kirmse realizes a system which allows the invitee 12(2) to easily participate in the game started by the inviter 12(1).

On the other hand, independent claim 14 recites a device cooperation service system that includes a control electronic device having a storage section for storing device information, concerning all other electronic devices connected to the network, which includes at least information used for identifying a device and information of executable device cooperation services; an identification section for identifying an execution electronic device which is operable to work in cooperation, based on the device information; a service information acquisition section for requesting a first server to retrieve all device cooperation services executable in combination of the control electronic device provided therewith and the execution electronic device, and acquiring, from the first server, service information containing the all device cooperation services executable having been retrieved; and an application acquisition section for specifying one of the all device cooperation services executable which are contained in the service information, and acquiring, from a second server, only an application necessary for executing the specified one of the all device cooperation services.

These features of claim 14 provide the advantage of allowing a user to easily find a combination of electronic devices necessary for executing the device cooperation service, and

cause each of the plurality of the electronic devices to download the most relevant application. Thereby, the cooperation service executed among the plurality of the electronic devices can be easily realized. The game control device disclosed in Kirmse does not include these features as recited in claim 14, or the advantages realized by these features.

At the outset, it should be noted that the claimed storage section, as recited in claim 14, is a necessary component to perform processes of the claimed identification section and the service information acquisition section, and is required to be included in the control electronic device. In rejecting claim 14, the Examiner asserts that the buddy lists in Kirmse can reasonably be considered to correspond to the claimed storage section as recited in claim 14. Applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion. In particular, if it is assumed that the buddy lists in Kirmse correspond to the claimed storage section, the system configuration of Kirmse is entirely different from that recited in claim 14. For example, according to the features recited in claim 14, it is necessary that the control electronic device specifies an execution electronic device which executes the service in cooperation with the control electronic device; whereas in Kirmse, the inviter 12(1)(i.e., the control electronic device) does not particularly specify the invitee 12(2) (i.e., the execution electronic device) which executes a game (i.e., a service) in cooperation with the inviter 12(1). In other words, it is not necessary that the inviter 12(1) specifies the invitee 12(2). For example, in Kirmse, the inviter 12(1) merely makes an unspecified number of invitations (or a specific number of invitations based on the buddy lists) to participate in the game, and participation in the game is determined by each invitee 12(2). In this regard, the system configuration of Kirmse is entirely different from that recited in claim 14. For these reasons, the buddy lists in Kirmse cannot reasonably be considered to correspond to the claimed storage section as recited in claim 14.

Furthermore, Applicants disagree with the Examiner's assertion that Kirmse discloses, in lines 36-45 of column 7, the claimed identification section. The invitations sent by the inviter 12(1) in Kirmse are not based on information used for identifying a device and information of executable device cooperation services, i.e., device information. As noted above, in Kirmse, the inviter 12(1) merely makes an unspecified number of invitations (or a specific number of invitations based on the buddy lists) to participate in the game, and participation in the game is

determined by each invitee 12(2). In this regard, there is no disclosure with respect to the claimed identification section as recited in claim 14.

Additionally, Applicants disagree with the Examiner's assertion that Kirmse discloses, in lines 26-36 of column 7 and in lines 54-59 of column 5, the claimed service information acquisition section, and the claimed application acquisition section, as recited in claim 14. In Kirmse, a game (i.e., a service) executed by the inviter 12(1) (i.e., the control electronic device) is predetermined. Contrary to claim 14, in Kirmse the inviter 12(1) does not select, after obtaining information about a plurality of device cooperation services (i.e., games) from the game server 14, any one of the device cooperation services. In contrast to the Examiner's assertions, there is no disclosure in lines 26-36 of column 7 and in lines 54-59 of column 5, of Kirmse, regarding the claimed service information acquisition section, and the claimed application acquisition section, as recited in claim 14.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 14 is not anticipated by Kirmse under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). Claims 15-21 and 23 also are not anticipated by virtue of their dependencies.

Like claim 14, independent claim 1 recites a storage section for storing device information, concerning all other electronic devices connected to the network, which includes at least information used for identifying a device and information of executable device cooperation services; an identification section for identifying another electronic device which is operable to work in cooperation, based on the device information; a service information acquisition section for requesting a predetermined server connected to the network to retrieve all device cooperation services executable in combination of the electronic device provided therewith and the other electronic having been identified, and acquiring, from the predetermined server, service information containing the all device cooperation services executable having been retrieved; and an application acquisition section for specifying one of the all device cooperation services executable which are contained in the service information, and acquiring, from a predetermined server connected to the network, only an application necessary for executing the specified one of the all device cooperation services. For reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 14, Kirmse cannot reasonably be considered to disclose or suggest these features as recited

in claim 1. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 1 is allowable over Kirmse. Claims 2-4, 6 and 7 also are allowable over Kirmse by virtue of their dependencies.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above, it is submitted that claims 1-4, 6, 7, 14-21 and 23 are allowable over the prior art of record and that the present application is now clearly in condition for allowance. The Examiner therefore is requested to pass this case to issue.

In the event that the Examiner has any comments or suggestions of a nature necessary to place this case in condition for allowance, then the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney by telephone to promptly resolve any remaining matters.

Respectfully submitted,

Takahiro WATANABE et al.

/Timothy S. Smith/
By: 2008.04.18 14:34:06 -04'00'
Timothy S. Smith
Registration No. 58,355
Attorney for Applicants

TSS/JRF/ats
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
April 18, 2008